

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 and 75-84 were examined, with all other claims having been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement. The claims have been amended and cancelled as noted above. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the rejection of claim 32 as being indefiniteness is now moot as claim 32 has been cancelled.

Independent claim 1, as well as various claims dependent thereon, were rejected as being anticipated by the Quinn '242 patent and separately by the McDermott '462 patent.

Such objections have been overcome by amending independent claim 1 to more particularly recite the structure illustrated, for example, in Fig. 2. Claim 1 now sets forth that the anchor includes not only the primary fluid conduit passing through the structure, as previously set forth, but also both a first arm and a second arm defined by the double wall structure, where the arms are laterally opposed. In addition, new dependent claim 101 further sets forth that the first and second arms are positioned to be anchored in the renal arteries when the anchor is positioned in the aorta.

Neither of the cited references suggests such a structure. McDermott '462 is perhaps the most pertinent as it discloses a pair of bifurcated limbs 16 and 18 intended to extend into the iliac arteries at the bottom of an abdominal aortic graft. Such a structure would be entirely unsuitable to serve as an anchor at the top of an aortic graft. While the "limbs 16 and 18" do diverge, they would be unsuitable for positioning within the renal arteries as the main aortic lumen would then be blocked off from blood flow.

The teachings of Quinn '242 are even less pertinent. While the primary graft 100 and secondary graft 300 might arguably define inner and outer walls, such "walls" are not joined together in any way that would create a "void adapted to be filled with fixation media" as required by claim 1 even prior to amendment. Moreover, the amendment discussed above would even further avoid the teachings of Quinn which do not show the second laterally extending arm set forth in claim 1, as amended.

Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2006

For these reasons, Applicants believe that independent claim 1, as well as all claims dependent thereon, are in condition for allowance.

Applicants note that new claims 98-100 have been added. These claims are directed at a preferred example of the anchor which is loaded onto a delivery catheter, or the delivery catheter optionally includes a shapeable (new claim 99) and/or a mediate delivery tube (new claim 100).

CONCLUSION

As all other independent claim sets have been cancelled, it is believed that the claims are now in condition for allowance and requested that the application be passed to issue at an early date.

If for any reason the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Heslin
Reg. No. 29,541

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JMH:rr/jke
60983201 v1